



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/585,320	06/02/2000	Michel Decary	13392	7176

293 7590 03/28/2005

Ralph A. Dowell of DOWELL & DOWELL P.C.
2111 Eisenhower Ave.
Suite 406
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 09/585,320	Applicant(s) DECARY, MICHEL	
	Examiner Lamont M Spooner	Art Unit 2654	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: 1-3, 5-7, 37-50, 52-54 and 56.
Claim(s) objected to: 4, 22, 24, 51, and 55.
Claim(s) rejected: 17 and 19-24.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 8-16, 18, 25-36.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

RICHEMOND DORVILLE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. **Claims 4, 22, 24, 51, and 55** objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 4, page 3 line 9, "at step b)" holds an antecedent basis ambiguity with reference to claims 1 and 4.

In claim 22, page 7 line 5, "at step a)" holds an antecedent basis ambiguity with reference to claims 17 and 22.

In claim 24, page 9 line 3, "the at least two words", the claim is directed towards two nodes, not explicitly two words.

In claim 51, page 13, line 8, "at step b)" holds an antecedent basis ambiguity with reference to claims 6, 49 and 51.

In claim 55, page 15, line 3, "at step b)" holds an antecedent basis ambiguity with reference to claims 7, 53, and 55.

In claim 39, page 11, line 1, after ",", insert - - each parse tree in said parse tree group including a word of the sentence, - -.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. **Claims 17, 23, and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2654

In claim 17, 23, and 24, pages 5 line 10, page 6 lines 1 and 2; page 8, lines 3 and 4; and page 8 lines 11 and 12, respectively, the phrase "at least some of the nodes that form the parse tree are associated to a word in the sentence" has not been described in the specification. In a phone conversation with the Applicant's Representative, Ralph Dowell, on March 14, 2002, the new matter was presented and queried for lack of substantiation in the specification

3. **Claims 19-22** further limit their parent claims and thus are rejected for the same reasons.

4. **Claims 8-16, 18, and 25-36** have been cancelled.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 37-50, 52-54, 56 are allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

As per **claims 1, 6, 7, and 37**, which are deemed to be a non-obvious improvement over the invention patented by Heidorn by the incorporation of a parse tree group, wherein each parse tree in said parse tree group includes a word of the sentence and having dependency data element describing a syntactic relationship between at least two words of the sentence, and further determining a semantic representation of at least part of a sentence from extracted information from the parse tree group, has neither been anticipated nor found in obvious combination with the other cited prior art of record.

As per **claim 38**, which are deemed to be a non-obvious improvement over the invention patented by Heidorn by the incorporation of a parse tree group, wherein each

Art Unit: 2654

parse tree in said parse tree group includes a node associated to a word of a sentence and having a dependency data element describing a syntactic relationship between at least two words of the sentence, and further determining a semantic representation of at least part of a sentence from extracted information from the parse tree group, has neither been anticipated nor found in obvious combination with the other cited prior art of record. claims 41-48 depend from the allowed parent claim 38, and therefore are allowed.

As per **claim 39**, which is deemed an non-obvious improvement over the invention patented by van Zuijlen having a plurality of parse trees wherein each parse tree said parse tree group includes a word of the sentence, and by generating on the basis of the parse tree group a plurality of lexical frames, and further processing multiple lexical frames on the basis of a set of information extraction rules to derive an information record being indicative of a semantic representation of at least part of a sentence, has neither been anticipated nor found in obvious combination with any other cited prior art of record.

Claims 2, 3, 5, and 40-50, 52-54, and 56 further limit their parent claims and therefore are allowed.

6. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M Spooner whose telephone number is 703/305-8661. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 703/305-9645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2654

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms
03/07/04